

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/623,625	07/21/2003		Christopher J. Wood	SEA0820P1041US	5180	
32116	7590	04/01/2004		EXAMINER		
	,	KATZ, CLARK &	NGO, LIEN M			
500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60661				3727		

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/623,625	WOOD ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	LIEN TM NGO	3727				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 Ju</u>	ly 2003.					
,	·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	•					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	•					
 4) □ Claim(s) 10-16 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) 10-16 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the E					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the c	3, 7	, ,				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Expension 11.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/21/03.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

Art Unit: 3727

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 10-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kleissendorf (4,934,556) or Wright (5,031,784).

Kleissendorf discloses, in fig. 2, and col. 4, claim 8, a hinge structure 6 comprising an elastomeric element exerting a force to urge a lid from a closed position toward an open position. It is inherent that the elastomeric element has an outer surface that is in tension when the lid is in the closed position and has an inner surface being in compress when the lid is in compression.

Wright discloses, in fig. 1, claims 1, 2 and 11, a hinge structure 13 comprising an elastomeric element exerting a force to urge a lid from a closed position toward an open position. It is inherent that the elastomeric element has an outer surface that is in tension when the lid is in the closed position and has an inner surface being in compress when the lid is in compression.

In regard to claim 12, the method of making, for example, bi-injection molding does not have a patentable weight in the product-by-process claim (see MPEP2113)

Application/Control Number: 10/623,625 Page 3

Art Unit: 3727

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleissendorf or Wright. Although Kleissendorf or Wright does not disclose the elastomeric element being rubber, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the elastomeric element being rubber in order provide a desired flexible hinge, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.
- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Verma (5,395,006) teaches a flexible hinge biasing toward an open position.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LIEN TM NGO whose telephone number is 703-305-0294. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM -6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 3727

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LEE YOUNG can be reached on 703-308-2572. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lien Ngo

March 30, 2004